



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,254	04/14/2004	John F. Burd	OCULIR03	6520

27189 7590 08/24/2004

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP
530 B STREET
SUITE 2100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER

KREMER, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3736

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/824,254	Applicant(s) BURD ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew J Kremer	Art Unit 3736	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/14/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0049389 to Abreu. In regard to claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 12-14, and 17, Abreu teaches detecting radiation in the spectrum of 4 to 14 microns (in which the Applicant defines as the mid-infrared spectrum), and determining glucose concentration based on the emitted spectrum. (paragraph 1159-1160 of Abreu). In regard to claims 5-6 and 15-16, the method is used to determine glucose in the blood of the human body. (Abstract of Abreu). In regard to claims 9-10 and 18, a filter 2662 is used. (paragraph 1159 of Abreu). In regard to claims 11 and 19, a processor 2672 is disclosed. (Fig. 100C of Abreu). In regard to claim 20, Abreu discloses a computer processor with a computer program (a data processing unit), a memory (recording unit), and a communications interface (a modem). (paragraph 0151 of Abreu). It is noted that the limitation “for downloading and storing data collected according to claim 1” in claim 20, lines 1-2 is merely “intended use” language, which cannot be relied upon to define over Abreu, since Abreu discloses all of the claimed elements and their recited

relationships. See *Ex parte Masham* 2 USPQ 2nd 1647. In regard to claim 21, Abreu discloses a computer processor with a computer program (a data processing unit), a memory (recording unit), and a communications interface (a modem). (paragraph 0151 of Abreu). It is noted that the limitation "for downloading and storing data collected according to claim 12" in claim 21, lines 1-2 is merely "intended use" language, which cannot be relied upon to define over Abreu, since Abreu discloses all of the claimed elements and their recited relationships. See *Ex parte Masham* 2 USPQ 2nd 1647. In regard to claims 22-23, Abreu teaches the step of downloading measurements to a computer system (a hospital based computer system). (paragraph 0151 of Abreu).

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 20-21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 35 of copending Application No. 10/428410 ('410). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they

are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 20 of the present application, claim 21 of the present application, and claim 35 of '410 claim a computer system comprising the elements of (a) a computer processor, (b) a memory, (c) a communications interface, and (d) a computer program. The only distinction between these claims is the limitations "for downloading and storing data, collected according to the method of claim 1" in claim 20 of the present application, "for downloading and storing data, collected according to the method of claim 12" in claim 21 of the present application, and "for downloading and storing data, collected from an instrument according to claim 12 or 23" in claim 35 of '410, which is merely "intended use" language that does not add any structural limitation to the claimed inventions. Also, it is noted that the "data" in all three claims are referring to the same type of data, particularly infrared spectra and analyte concentrations.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claims 20-21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of copending Application No. 10/824214 ('214). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 20 of the present application, claim 21 of the present application, and claim 12 of '214 claim a computer system comprising the elements of (a) a computer processor, (b) a memory, (c) a communications interface, and (d) a computer program. The only distinction between

these claims is that limitations “for downloading and storing data, collected according to the method of claim 1” in claim 20 of the present application, “for downloading and storing data, collected according to the method of claim 12” in claim 21 of the present application, and “for downloading and storing data, collected according to claim 1” in claim 12 of ‘214, which is merely “intended use” language that does not add any structural limitation to the claimed inventions. Also, it is noted that the “data” in all three claims are referring to the same type of data, particularly infrared spectra and analyte concentrations.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J Kremer whose telephone number is 703-605-0421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. through Fri. between 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on 703-308-3130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Matthew Kremer
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 3736



ERIC F. WINAKUR
PRIMARY EXAMINER